DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 426 AC 010 451

AUTHOR Given, C. William; Mitchell, John B.
TITLE A Social System's Analysis of the Structure of Influence in a Small Community.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology.
NOTE 23p.; Part of Hatch Project 304 "A Study of the Decision-Making Process in Small Communities"

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Community Leaders, *Power Structure, *Rural Areas, *Social Systems, *Socioeconomic Influences
IDENTIFIERS Hatch Project 304

ABSTRACT

The structure of influence in a community is the ordering and patterning of the interaction within a system based on the element power (influence) and all other elements as they relate to the use of influence within the social system. The structure of influence in a rural community, Riverview (a pseudonym for the town), Ohio, was analyzed, using four subsystems: the economic, the civic, the educational, and the governmental. The methodology used in data gathering was: (1) the selection of "judges" who were knowledgeable in one or more areas of community life; and (2) the designation of community influentials by the judges. In Riverview, 9 judges nominated 21 individuals two or more times, and 18 of these people were interviewed. Six of the 18 were mentioned four or more times in answers to questions concerning general community influence; only these individuals were considered as general reputed community influentials. This influence was based on particular elements such as power (both formal and informal), rank, status-role position, sentiment, and sanctions. No vertical systems--extracommunity based power--were active in the structure of influence within the community. The social system as a conceptual tool is useful as a theoretical framework from which to analyze the structure of influence. (DB)

ED052426

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A SOCIAL SYSTEM'S ANALYSIS OF THE STRUCTURE OF INFLUENCE IN A SMALL COMMUNITY*

By
C. William Given and John B. Mitchell**

INTRODUCTION

The community has within recent years become one of the most investigated units of our society. The rapid growth of government self-help programs has created a greater awareness on the part of local change agents of the importance of the structure of social power at the community level. In many instances these agents became aware of social power when projects, initiated by them, began to meet resistance from community members. Decision-making and community change almost without exception involves key power figures in the local community.

Analyses of community power structures have received considerable attention from sociologists since the publication in the fifties of Community Power Structure.[1] Floyd Hunter, the author popularized the com-

---

[1] Hunter, Floyd, Community Power Structure. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1953.

*This study is a part of a larger project in the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology at The Ohio State University, Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, Hatch 304, "A Study of the Decision-Making Process in Small Communities."

**Former Research Assistant and presently Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Michigan State University, and Professor of Rural Sociology, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Ohio Research and Development Center, The Ohio State University.

AC010451

munity as a source of inquiry. His methodological techniques greatly facilitated the study of community power.

Research on community power structures has largely focused on the larger urban communities. Small rural communities have received less attention than the more urbanized areas. Some researchers, however, have considered the small community, for example Presthus,[2] Vidich and Bensman,[3] Powers,[4] Sollie,[5] and Bohlen and others.[6]* Each of these studies report a small number of persons influential in several areas of community life.

This paper reports on the method of analysis and findings concerning the structure of influence in a small community. The intent of this paper is to provide information especially pertinent for professionals engaged in community-wide action programs; for example, community resource development, regional development or planning, and pollution control programs. These data may also be of value to those concerned with the formation of regional and/or multi-county committees for study or action programs.

---

[2]Presthus, Robert. Men at the Top. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

[3]Vidich, Arthur J. and Joseph Bensman. Small Town in Mass Society. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1958.

[4]Powers, Ronald C., "Identifying Community Power Structures." Unpublished paper, Iowa State University, 1964.

[5]Sollie, Carlton R., "A Comparison of Reputational Techniques for Identifying Community Leaders." Rural Sociology, 31 (Sept. '66) pp. 301-309.

[6]Bohlen, Joe M., George M. Beal, Gerald E. Klonglan and John L. Tait, "Community Power Structure and Civil Defense." Rural Sociology Report No. 35, Iowa State University, 1964; and Bohlen, Joe M. et. al., "Community Power Actors and Civil Defense." Rural Sociology Report No. 40, Iowa State University, 1965.

*For a review of 33 studies involving 55 communities see John Walton, "Substance and Artifact: The Current Status of Research on Community Power Structure," American Journal of Sociology (Vol. 71, No. 4, January 1966) pp. 430-438.

The objectives of this paper are:

1. Analyze the structure of influence in a community in order to understand the scope of power held by reputed influentials.
2. Examine the sources of influence to understand the relationships of community based power and extra-community based power using social systems concepts (elements).
3. Determine the possible interaction among power holders in making decisions which affect community life.

THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The Social System

This study was undertaken using the social system model as the conceptual tool for the analysis. It was decided to use Loomis's[7] model for this study as he has delineated elements common to all systems.

The social system as Loomis defines it (16, p. 4) is: ". . . composed of the patterned interaction of members. It is constituted of the interaction of a plurality of individual actors whose relations to each other are mutually oriented through the definition and mediation of a pattern of structured and shared symbols and expectations." From this definitive perspective, Loomis moves to the analytic aspects of interaction--the elements--which he uses to analyze the structure of any social system. These elements are: (1) belief (knowledge); (2) sentiment; (3) end, goal, or objective; (4) norm; (5) status-role (position); (6) rank; (7) power; (8) sanction; and (9) facility. Loomis then considers the processes which:

---

[7] Loomis, Charles P., Social Systems: Essays on Their Persistence and Change. Princeton: Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1960.

". . . mesh, stabilize, and alter the relations between the elements through time, they are the tools through which the social system may be understood as a dynamic functioning continuity. . ." (16, p. 5-6).

Loomis then combines these basic elements into six master processes which can be used to analyze group behavior within the social system framework. Each master process includes one or several of the basic elements or processes. These master processes are: (1) communication; (2) boundary maintenance; (3) systemic linkage; (4) socialization; (5) social control; and (6) institutionalization. The two master processes used in this study were systemic linkage and boundary maintenance.

Boundary maintenance is a process which insures that the identity of the social system is preserved and the interaction pattern characteristic of the individual system maintained. Boundary maintenance as a process becomes operative when the social system is threatened. Specific elements available to system members interested in increasing boundary maintenance activities are: power, goals, rank, and sanctions. Boundary maintenance tends to increase integration and solidarity of the system, making it distinct from other systems and insuring its continuance.

Systemic linkage represents the reverse process of boundary maintenance. Systemic linkage provides for the interaction and integration of two or more systems. This is accomplished through the articulation of one or more elements in such a manner that on certain occasions or at certain times the two systems may be viewed as a single system.

Social Power

The concept of social power has been the focal point of a long standing debate within sociological and philosophical circles. The debate has

centered about the conceptualization of power as authority--the right of a specific position--versus power in its informal aspects which includes coercion and voluntary influence.

This study did not concern itself with delineating the types of power utilized by influentials to make decisions consistent with their values. The general term influence was used in this study to include both formal power, which accompanies a status-role position and informal power which could include coercion, or evolve as a product of a social relationship.

Influence was operationally defined as: That capacity to alter the course of events in a manner which they otherwise would not have been, through the use of a position, a reputation, or through factors related to the specific social relationship. It was these authors' opinion that influence is a combination of these factors, one of which may be dominant, but all of which are active in the course of influencing specific events.

Influence Structure

This paper is concerned with the description and analysis of the structure of influence in a community. The concept of social power has been operationally defined as influence, in order that the various formal and informal aspects of the concept might be included in the analysis.

The concept of influence structure must be defined so as to delineate it from the larger and more inclusive concept of social structure. Loomis views the social system as having social structure. Social structure, within a system, can be determined by observing the patterning and ordering of the interaction based on the elements of the system. The influence structure is the ordering and patterning of the interaction within a system based on the element power (influence) and all other elements as they relate to the use of influence within the social system.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology employed in gathering the data for this study closely paralleled the reputational technique. However, several other sources of data were utilized in order to substantiate or repute the purely reputational aspects of the data. Data concerning social systems membership of influentials and systems considered important in the ongoing life of the communities were determined during the course of the study.

Selection of Judges and Nomination of Influentials

The process used in arriving at the respondents to be interviewed was divided into two segments. One of the authors and an Extension resource development agent contacted the county agricultural Extension agent located in the community center. The agent was asked to name individuals whom he considered to be knowledgeable about the affairs of the community. The agent was asked to recommend individuals knowledgeable in one or more areas of community life such as politics or government, education, religion, agriculture and business or industry. Six to nine persons were selected for interviewing from the list of nominees. These individuals were considered to be "judges."

The "judges" were interviewed by one of the authors and the area resource development agent. They were asked to respond to questions concerning individuals whom they felt were important in causing things to happen, or keeping things from happening within the community. The judges were also asked to identify organizations which they perceived as influential in accomplishing projects within the community.

Persons mentioned two or more times were selected for interviewing with a pre-tested schedule of questions.

Designation of Community Influentials

In the Riverview community twenty-three individuals were nominated two or more times by the judges. Eighteen of the twenty-three individuals were interviewed.

The criteria for selecting community influentials was based on the number of times they were mentioned as general community influentials by influentials, i.e., those nominated by two or more judges. Knowledgeable individuals were designating persons whom they considered to be influential in the general community. While many other individuals in the community make decisions of lesser import, it was felt that persons mentioned four or more times would represent the top decision-makers in the community.

Individuals receiving four or more mentions as having influence in the general community will be designated as reputed community influentials. Persons who were interviewed but did not receive four mentions as having general community influence will be designated influential respondents.

The Subsystem Analysis

The four subsystems used in this study were: (1) the economic, (2) the civic, (3) the educational, and (4) the governmental. These four subsystems were chosen based on the review of literature and on their probability for involvement in community decision-making. Below is a brief definition of each subsystem.

The economic subsystem included the business and financial complex of the community. It included local industries, absentee-owned corporations, and national banks located in the community.

The civic subsystem included the six major civic organizations located in the community. These six organizations are: (1) Chamber of Commerce,

(2) Junior Chamber of Commerce, (3) Rotary Club, (4) Lions Club, (5) Kiwanis Club, and (6) Community Improvement Corporation or Development Council. These organizations were defined as civic because they have as their goal service to the community. These organizations were chosen because it was felt that they would play a more active role in community decision-making than would organizations which were not conceived around this basic goal.*

The educational subsystem was represented by the superintendent of the local school system and by the school board composed of community personnel who make policy decisions for the operation of the school.

The governmental subsystem included the mayor, or city manager, the city council, and any ad hoc committees which might be important in the analysis of that subsystem. The analysis included the city government positions as they were more closely involved in community decision-making than the county government positions.

Background of the Community

This study attempts to analyze the structure of influence in a rural community in southern Ohio with a population center of less than ten thousand inhabitants. The Riverview community is located in River County which has experienced a much slower rate of population increase than has the entire state.** Net migration in River County has been in the form of out-migration while the state as a whole has experienced in-migration. The percentage of individuals sixty-five years of age and over indicates that the out-migration has taken place among the younger ages, and the county has a higher percentage of aged persons than does the state.

---

*Only three of the six civic organizations were used as no reputed influentials were found to be members of either the Lions Club or the Kiwanis Club, and the age of the reputed influentials disqualified them for membership in the Junior Chamber of Commerce.

**Are pseudonyms for a municipality and county in Southern Ohio.

The ecological factors also reveal differences between the county and the state. River County has a lower median income per family than is true for the state. More than fifty percent of the farmers make more money in off-farm employment than they make on the farm. This syndrome of factors reveals several problems which exist in this community. Low income seems to be the result of a large under-employment in agriculture. This under-employment is the result of a lack of alternative sources of employment in this community. In River County no industry was found that employed over 75 people.

Service facilities of a special type provide a large source of employment for individuals in River County. These service facilities were vital to the community as they serve as a source of employment, use goods from local merchants, and provide a tax base for the community.

Low income and a low tax base increase the difficulty of making improvements at the community level. One result is poor public facilities for the population of the county.

Factors such as the depressed economic conditions and the out-migration aid in explaining the importance of specific sanctions, and the composition of the reputed community influential population.

FINDINGS

Reputed Influentials

Nine judges nominated twenty-one individuals two or more times, and eighteen of these persons were interviewed. Six of the eighteen were mentioned four or more times in response to questions concerning general community influence. These six were designated reputed community influentials.

The eighteen respondents did not mention anyone else as having general community influence more than twice. Table 1 indicates the number of times six influentials of the community were mentioned in response to the question concerning general community influence. The percentages indicate the number of times a reputed community influential was mentioned, in relation to the total possible mentions he could receive.

No list of names was given the respondent. Taking this into consideration, it would seem that a high degree of consensus existed among the respondents as to who affected general community decisions. Only one community influential received the minimum number of mentions while three received over fifty percent of the total possible mentions. These factors give support for the decision to consider only those individuals mentioned four or more times as general reputed community influentials.

Data on the influential respondents and their relationship to the reputed community influentials is presented in Appendix A.

Table 1

SIX REPUTED COMMUNITY INFLUENTIALS OF RIVERVIEW AND NUMBER OF MENTIONS RECEIVED AS GENERAL COMMUNITY INFLUENTIALS

Code Number Of Influential	Number of Mentions Received	Percentage of Total Possible Mentions
2	13	72
4	10	56
7	8	44
8	10	56
9	4	22
11	8	44

The Business and Economic Subsystem

The matrix reveals that three of the six reputed community influentials hold positions of importance in the three banks located in the Riverview community. Four also holds a high position on two of the largest business enterprises in the community. Two and eight are both attorneys. Two is chairman of the Republican party, while eight is chairman of the Democratic party. Seven in addition to being vice president of the Valley Bank, is also a co-owner of one of the largest department stores in the community. Two, eight, nine and eleven are all trustees of the Hilltop Hospital. The hospital as a business enterprise is of considerable importance to this community. It is the largest private employer in the community.

Eight, in addition to his law practice and financial interests, is the owner of a local radio station.

Each of these six reputed community influentials, with the exception of eleven, hold positions which are not easily threatened by other status-roles in the community. Eleven was employed to fill the presidency of a processing plant. This position as an employed administrator makes eleven vulnerable to influence from four.

The business enterprises are all locally owned and controlled. The only sizeable vertical subsystem in the community is a governmental facility and the administrative staff was not active in community affairs.

The business and financial subsystem is closed. The structure of this subsystem lies entirely within the boundaries of the community.

The six reputed community influentials seem to hold influence over the business and economic subsystem. They occupy important positions in all the financial institutions, and they are active in the business enterprises in the community.

Table 2

A MATRIX OF RIVERVIEW REPUTED COMMUNITY INFLUENTIAL MEMBERSHIP IN THE BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC SUBSYSTEM OF THE COMMUNITY

	Financial Institutions[a]			Business Enterprises[b]		
Code No. of Influential	Citizens Bank	National Bank	Valley Bank	F-C Meat Co.	Bar-E Industries	Hilltop Board of Trustees (Hospital)
2	Board of Directors					Chairman of Board
4			Pres.	Board of Directors	Board of Directors	
7			Vice Pres.			
8		Board of Directors				Board Member
9						Board Member
11			Pres.			Board Member

[a] Rand McNally International Bankers Directory, First 1965 Ed. Chicago: Rand McNally, p. 1534.

[b] Directory of Ohio Manufacturers, 1963, State of Ohio, Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Labor Statistics. The F. J. Heer Publishing Co., Columbus, p. 537.

From their formal positions each one is able to derive influence both from that position and from various informal sources of influence, such as prestige of the family name. All the influentials except eleven are second or third generation members of the community which would add to their informal source of influence.

From this analysis it can be stated that the six reputed community influentials do hold positions from which they can exert considerable influence over the business and economic subsystems.

The Civic Organizational Subsystem

Of the six organizations involved in the civic organizational subsystem reputed community influentials were eligible for membership in five. The age of the reputed influentials would disqualify them for membership in the Junior Chamber of Commerce. However, reputed community influentials held memberships in only three of the five organizations. (See Table 3).

Five of the six community influentials belong to the Chamber of Commerce, but only two attend regularly. When asked which organizations were most influential in the Riverview community, ten of the eighteen respondents named the Chamber of Commerce. However, five of the six reputed community influentials, when asked this same question, said that no influential organizations existed in Riverview. They, instead, felt that a coalition of individuals "working behind the scenes," was responsible for accomplishing community projects.

Thus it seems that only one civic organization was important in the life of the community. This important organization had reputed community influentials as members. The fact that no organizations dominate community life seems to be evidenced by the fact that the Development Council and the City

Table 3

A MATRIX OF RIVERVIEW REPUTED COMMUNITY INFLUENTIAL MEMBERSHIP IN THREE CIVIC ORGANIZATIONS AND THEIR PERCENT OF ATTENDANCE IN THE PAST TWELVE MONTHS

Code No. of Influentials	Chamber of Commerce		Development Council		Rotary Club	
	Member or Officer	Per Cent Attendance	Member or Officer	Per Cent Attendance	Member or Officer	Per Cent Attendance
2	Member	0				
4						
7	Member	16			Member	100
8	Member	100				
9	Member	0	Member	0		
11	Member	95			Member	95

Planning Commission were ranked second and third with six and three mentions respectively, by the eighteen respondents, when asked the question concerning influential organizations. While the influential respondents perceived the Chamber of Commerce as an influential organization, it must be remembered that the reputed influentials saw no organization as influential.

Considering the Chamber of Commerce as an influential organization due to the presence of reputed influentials as members might be an incorrect assumption in view of the fact that the reputed influentials themselves did not perceive this organization as influential.

The role of the reputed community influentials in the civic organizational subsystem is probably best summarized by a statement from four. When asked about organizations he stated that he did not belong to any organizations, but that he could be more effective behind the scenes. He then related to the interviewer: "When something important comes up I invite the key people involved out to my cabin in the country for dinner and some discussion." If this statement is representative of the six reputed community influentials, then it is reasonable to assume that they tend to divorce themselves from all but nominal participation in Riverview's civic organizations.

The Educational Subsystem

The educational subsystem is linked to the larger sphere of community life by eleven. He is president of the local school board. Through this position he is able to exert his influence as a community leader. His background as a vocational agriculture teacher uniquely qualifies him for this position. He is the only reputed community influential with professional knowledge of school problems and how they may be solved.

In documenting his influence over educational matters in the Riverview community three other factors are of relevance. First, in answer to the questions concerning influential individuals in educational matters, eleven received thirteen of eighteen possible mentions. This is unusual, as the superintendent of schools would normally be considered the most influential individual in school affairs. Secondly, the city superintendent was mentioned only four times as influential in educational matters. Two school board members, who were not interviewed, were each mentioned once and the County Superintendent of Schools was mentioned three times. Third, when the question concerning educational influence was posed to eleven he refused to name any individual. He did state that the superintendent was not influential in determining decisions about educational matters. From these three factors it is reasonable to assume that eleven is the key influential in the educational subsystem.

The Governmental Subsystem

The lines of influence in governmental subsystems are indirect, but they exist and are real for persons involved in community government.

Riverview has had the city manager form of city government for four years. The city manager received two mentions as a reputed community influential. The city commissioners were only mentioned once. This situation would seem to eliminate these formal status-roles as positions of major influence.

The city manager stated that all governmental leaders in the community talk to, in his words, "the top leaders" before they consider a final decision on important matters. While it was not learned whom he talked to, a historical example of reputed community influentials exerting their influence in the governmental subsystem will be presented.

The two reputed community influentials who have been most concerned with local government are two and eight. Eight related the development of the city manager form of government in Riverview.

In a very matter of fact tone he related how the city officials, through inept management of funds, had, in his mind, wasted local tax dollars. When the election came around the next year he and two activated both political parties behind a referendum to change the structure of local government and to make it more amenable to public control.

Such exercising of influence led several respondents, who were interviewed, to say that politics was the most important force in the Riverview community.

This is only one specific instance which shows the channels of influence from their base to the governmental subsystem. This brief account reveals how reputed community influentials were able to use power, rank and sentiment to invoke sanctions against positional leaders in the governmental subsystem.

The city manager, from his description of the communication between himself and "top leaders," realizes that power does not lie in his position. The reputed community influentials consciously recognize that they are the source of power in governmental affairs. A normative pattern of interaction appears to have developed between the positional leaders of the governmental subsystem and the reputed community influentials. The exact nature of this normative pattern would be difficult to discover. It does seem worthwhile to speculate about certain areas where this pattern would be activated.

The reputed community influentials are probably not interested in the day-to-day workings of community government. They do become interested

when local government is involved in such matters as committing facilities for industry or annexing land for industrial or housing developments. Three of the six reputed community influentials stated that they wanted to see Riverview remain a residential community--for industrial sites to be located elsewhere. They felt that large scale industrial development would bring an unfavorable element into the community. These reputed community influentials would oppose industrial development, and they would exert their influence upon the governmental subsystem to insure that certain facilities would not be offered to industry. In short, this pattern of interaction between positional leaders and reputed community influentials is activated when the "local" government is faced with a decision that would threaten the equilibrium of the community and ultimately the positions of these six men.

The data presented indicates that reputationally defined community influentials were influential in the four selected subsystems of the Riverview community. The influentials either occupied positions from which they could exert influence, or had indirectly exerted influence within the subsystems. The absence of vertical systems in the structure of influence was another factor which contributed to the dominance of local influentials.

Summary of Findings

1. Reputed community influentials were found to exert influence in four selected subsystems of the Riverview Community.
2. The reputed community influentials were the source of this influence as no vertical systems were found to be active in the four subsystems.

3. This influence was based on particular elements such as power--both formal and informal, rank, status-role position, sentiment, and sanctions.
4. No vertical systems--extracommunity based power--were active in the structure of influence within the community.

CONCLUSIONS

The influence structure represents the focal point of this analysis. In Riverview, the structure of influence was directed by the community influentials. The four subsystems of the Riverview community were closely integrated through influence exerted upon them by reputed community influentials.*

A common sanction described in this study has been the economic sanction. It was shown that the reputed community influentials were closely associated with the major financial institutions and business enterprises. Use of economic sanctions becomes doubly effective in an area where alternative sources of employment and facilities for borrowing money are practically non-existent. These sanctions, based on the status-role positions, are quite important. However, sanctions steming from such informal aspects as family name and prestige must also be considered at work in influencing decisions.

The master processes involved in this comparison are combinations of the primary elements and processes. The two important master processes are: (1) systemic linkage, and (2) boundary maintenance.

---

*Note information in Appendix A.

These master processes are complementary. Systemic linkage deals with the integrative and interdependent features of the subsystems while boundary maintenance deals with the features that differentiate and distinguish systems or subsystems.

As no vertical system with sizeable local resources impinged upon the influence structure of Riverview it can be deduced that the boundaries are tightly maintained. A concrete example of how the boundaries are maintained was exhibited by the reputed community influential who stated that they did not want industry to locate in Riverview. Industrial development might alter the structure of influence making the community subject to influence from sources beyond its sociological boundary.

In Riverview the major influence structure was located entirely within the community and closely integrated the community. This situation defines the relationship between systemic linkage and boundary maintenance. When influence has its source within the community, and when it closely integrated the community, then the boundaries of that community will be tightly maintained.

The social system as a conceptual tool is useful as a theoretical framework from which to analyze the structure of influence. It also represents a general framework from which the researcher can make comparisons to other influence structures based on the specific manner in which the elements are used and combined.

APPENDIX A

TWELVE INFLUENTIAL RESPONDENTS OF RIVERVIEW, THEIR STATUS-ROLE POSITIONS AND NUMBER OF TIMES MENTIONED AS REPUTED COMMUNITY INFLUENTIALS

Respondent Code Number	Status-Role Position	No. of Mentions Received as a Reputed Community Influential
1	Restaurant Owner	1
3	Lawyer - son of reputed influential 2	0
5	Retired - brother of reputed influential 4	2
6	Administrator of hospital where reputed influential 9 is Chief of Staff	2
10	City Commissioner - merchant	0
12	Retired - board of trustees of hospital where reputed influential 9 is Chief of Staff	2
13	President Chamber of Commerce Manager Rural Electric Corp.	1
14	Lawyer - partner of reputed influential 8	0
15	City Manager	2
16	County Extension Agent	0
17	City Commissioner - optometrist	0
18	President Development Council - Printer	2

The 12 influential respondents who were not mentioned a sufficient number of times to be considered reputed community influentials are presented in the table above. Two types of information are presented: (1) the status-role held by the influential respondent, and (2) the number of times he was mentioned as a reputed community influential.

From this table several factors become evident. None of the 12 influential respondents received more than two mentions as a reputed community influential. Respondents 3 and 5 have a kinship relation to two reputed community influentials. Respondents 6, 12 and 14 all hold positions which would necessitate a close relationship with two of the reputed community influentials. Respondents 10, 15, and 17 all hold positions which are vulnerable to public opinion. Status-role positions or kinship ties closely link five of the twelve influential respondents to the six reputed community influentials. Influential respondents 15 and 18 were the only respondents receiving two mentions as a general reputed community influential who were not closely related to the six reputed community influentials through status-role positions or kinship.

APPENDIX B

Definition of Community

(Used with judges and influentials.)

Riverview Community

Would you draw a line around the area which you consider to be the Riverview community? We would like you to include not only the incorporated limits of Riverview but also the area outside of the town where people feel they are a part of this community. For example the area around Riverview from which people come to trade, buy most of their groceries and drugs, see the doctor and buy appliances in Riverview.

A community is largely self-sufficient and the people share a common life.

APPENDIX C

Questions Asked Judges

Who are the people who can cause things to happen or can keep things from happening in this community? The people who are influential in community affairs.

What organizations, groups, or institutions are particularly significant (important) in the life of this community? They may be in areas such as education, religion, business, industry, government and civic affairs.

ERIC Clearinghouse
AUG 13 1971
on Adult Education